

Remarks/Arguments

The Rejection of Claim 1 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,678,014 (Owen et al.). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

Anticipation requires that all of the elements of the claim be taught within the four corners of a single reference.

Owen does not teach or suggest a flange

Owen does not teach the amended Claim 1 limitation: "...a flange..." Owen does not disclose a flange (149, 149') as asserted by the Examiner. In the previous reply, Applicant supplied the following definition of a flange: "a rib or rim for strength, for guiding, or for attachment to another object <a *flange* on a pipe> <a *flange* on a wheel>." (Merriam-Webster On-line Dictionary). In the Office Action of January 7, 2005, the Examiner acknowledges that 144 is a nozzle, not a flange. A nozzle is defined as: "a : a projecting vent of something b : a short tube with a taper or constriction used (as on a hose) to speed up or direct a flow of fluid." (Merriam-Webster On-Line Dictionary). 149 has a tubular shape, as shown in Figure 6 of Owen, and this shape is exactly described as a "projecting vent," per the preceding definition. Thus, 149 is not a flange.

Owen gives a very exact definition of 149': "...the connector portion 149 of the nozzle 144 has provided thereon a *valve-engaging projection* 149' (emphasis added)" (col. 7, lines 1-3). Owen states that 149 is a portion of the nozzle, and further states that 149' is a projection of this nozzle portion. Further, "The projection 149' preferably is configured generally as an *extension* (emphasis added) of the outer surface of connector portion 149..." (col.7, lines 15-17). Assuming *arguendo* that Owen's definition does not disqualify 149' as a flange, we can again compare 149' to the preceding definitions for "flange" and "nozzle." Clearly, 149' fits very much more closely to the definition of a nozzle, specifically, a "projecting vent," than to the definition of a flange. This assertion is confirmed by the structure shown for 149' in Figure 6 of Owen, which is a partial tubular section, not a rib or rim.

Owen makes no mention of a flange (the word is not used in Owen) and none of the Figures in Owen portray the disc-like shape associated with a flange, as shown in Figure 1 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide a definition from an appropriate reference to support the assertion that 149 and 149' are flanges.

Thus, Claim 1 recites structure (a flange) not taught by Owen.

The disclosed and suggested functions of 149 and 149' are not those of a flange

Owen describes functions for 149 and 149' that are clearly not associated with a flange. For example, the Examiner has asserted that 144 is a nozzle and it is clear that 149 is a continuation of 144, meant to continue directing fluid into the inflatable device. This is exactly the definition stated above. Further: "...valve-engaging projection 149' which is configured to engage and move the safety valve member S.V. attendant to insertion of connector portion 149 into the tubular portion T of the fill valve construction of an inflatable article." (col. 7, lines 2-5). Regarding 149', Applicant again notes that Owen teaches a specific function for 149' as "a valve-engaging projection." This function is nonanalogous with a flange. Thus, 149 and 149' are inserted into a tubular portion, a function unrelated to the structure and purpose of a flange. In fact, this function is opposite the function normally associated with a flange. For example, in the context of a circular opening, such as the opening of a safety valve, a flange would surround the exterior of the opening to seal the opening, as is the case for the present invention. A flange would not enter the interior of the opening as Owen teaches for 149 and 149'.

Owen does not teach all the elements of Claim 1. Therefore, Owen cannot anticipate Claim 1, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 be removed.

Rejection of Claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,678,014 (Owen et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,422,560 (Yan).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Also, the

Attorney Docket No. KEYP:120US
U.S. Patent Application No. 10/605,711
Reply to Final Office Action dated: January 7, 2005
Request for Reconsideration After Final dated: March 7, 2005

ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Also, the prior art references cited by the Examiner must teach or suggest the claim limitations of the subject invention.

Owen does not teach or suggest all the elements of Claim 1

As shown above, Owen does not teach or suggest all the elements of Claim 1. Yan does not cure the defects of Owen. Yan teaches a battery charger.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentable over Owen in view of Yan. Claims 3-5, dependent from Claim 1, also are patentable over the cited references and reconsideration of the rejection is requested.

The Objection of Claim 2 as Being Dependent Upon a Rejected Base Claim

Claim 2 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 2 depends from Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentable over the prior art. Therefore, Claim 2 is not dependent from a rejected base claim and Applicant requests that the objection to Claim 2 be removed.

Attorney Docket No. KEYP:120US
U.S. Patent Application No. 10/605,711
Reply to Final Office Action dated: January 7, 2005
Request for Reconsideration After Final dated: March 7, 2005

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,



C. Paul Maliszewski, P.E.
Registration No. 51,990
CUSTOMER NO. 24041
Simpson & Simpson, PLLC
5555 Main Street
Williamsville, NY 14221-5406
Telephone No. 716-626-1564

CPM

Dated: March 7, 2005